

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-24 are now present in this application.

Claims 1, 7, 12, 18 and 23 have been amended. Claims 2 and 13 have been canceled and no new claims have been added.

I. Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to the claims because of an informality. The abbreviation "GDI" should be spelled out at least once. Accordingly, the claim amendments obviate the objection made by the Examiner, and Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the objections.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejects claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because they disclose a claimed invention that is an abstract idea as defined in the case *In re Warmerdam*, 33, F 3d 1354, 31 USPQ 2d 1754 (Fed. Cir. 1994). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants remind the Examiner that MPEP §2107.02 II. states that "[u]pon initial examination, the Examiner should review the specification to determine if there are any statements asserting that the claimed invention is useful for a particular purpose. A complete disclosure should include a statement which identifies a specific and substantial utility for the invention."

Further, MPEP §2107.02 II. A. states that "[a] statement of specific and substantial utility should fairly and clearly explain why the Applicant believes the invention is useful. Such statements will usually explain the purpose of or how the invention may be used, (e.g., a compound is believed to be useful in the treatment of a particular disorder). Regardless of the form of the statement of utility, it must enable one of ordinary skill in the art why the Applicants believe the claimed invention is useful."

Moreover, MPEP §2107.02 III A. states that "[a]s a matter of patent office practice, a specification which contains a disclosure of utility which corresponds in scope to the subject matter sought to be patented must be taken as sufficient to satisfy the utility requirement of §101

for the entire claimed subject matter unless there is a reason for one skilled in the art to question the objective truth of the statement of the utility or scope.” (Emphasis in the original.)

Accordingly, Applicants believe that there is ample disclosure of a specific and substantial utility for the invention. Therefore, although independent claim 1 has been amended, for example, such amendment is not made necessarily pursuant to the rejection under §101, but instead to more clearly claim Applicants’ claimed invention.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections Under U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejects claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,909,578 to Buzbee (hereinafter “Buzbee”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, independent claim 1 positively recites, a process for modifying information from a source language to a target language comprising the steps, *inter alia*, comparing said intercepting data against data in a core translation table to determine if a match exists between the data being accepted and the data in the core translation table for the source language; and replacing an intercepting data with said data from said core translation table based when a match is found based on said comparing step, and when no match is found based on said comparing step the data is redirected to a resource letter for the process for modifying information or the graphic data interface for normal processing in displaying the information on a display device. These claimed features are amply supported by the embodiments disclosed in the specification.

Applicants submit that, in dramatic contrast to the claimed invention, Buzbee fails to at least teach or suggest each and every element of for example independent claim 1, including the features identified above. That is, as best understood, there is simply nothing in Buzbee that remotely suggests a process for modifying information from a source language to a target language comprising the steps of comparing and intercepting data against data in core translation table to determine if a match exists between the data being intercepted and the data in the core translation table for the source language and modifying information or the graphic data interface

for normal processing and displaying the information upon a display device, as required by independent claim 1, for example.

Instead, with regards to Buzbee, and as far as Buzbee is understood, it appears that Buzbee is primarily focused upon evaluating sections of a computer program application to determine if that computer program application is operating optimally. Furthermore, Buzbee employs a targeted profiling technique to target and map, that is, further assimilate the optimal structure and design of certain aspects of the programming application. See, for example, Buzbee, col. 2, lines 20-27 and 35-36.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Buzbee fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements recited by amended independent claim 1 and similarly amended independent claims 12 and 23. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 and similarly claims 12 and 23 are clearly patentable over Buzbee. Because claims 3-11 and 14-22 and 24 dependent from independent claims 1, 12 and 23, respectively, these claims are at least patentable by virtue of their dependency as well as for their additional recitations. With regards to claims 2 and 13, the rejection to those claims is rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 2 and 13. The immediate withdrawal of the prior art rejections of claim 1, 3-12, and 14-24 is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion


All matters having been addressed in view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicants' undersigned representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains an issue in which the Examiner feels would be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-2448. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any overpayments to the above-referenced deposit account.

Dated: November 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  96463
Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant